

MEETING MINUTES FOR THE APRIL 13, 1993
OU2 MEETING WITH EPA AND CDH

ATTENDEES

Scott Grace - DOE
Jim Koffer-EG&G
Tom Greengard-EG&G
Annette Primrose-EG&G
Eric Dille'-EG&G

Bill Fraser-EPA
Joe Schieffelin-CDH
Wayne Belcher-EG&G
Barry Roberts-EG&G

DISCUSSION TOPICS

Subsurface IM/IRA
Groundwater Modeling
TM-8 Bedrock Work Plan
Schedule Relief due to OU1 decisions
OU2 EE

SUBSURFACE IM/IRA

EG&G/DOE Contract for the soil vapor survey is being acquired.

OU2 Surface water IM/IRA treatability system cannot handle ground water from the 903 Pad area due to the high chlorides in the water. It can treat ground water from other OU2 proposed test site areas.

Requested delay in Test 2 Plan submittal until Test 1 data results received. Test 2 could include the new technology for steam extraction as proposed by EG&G. However, this would need to be delayed to 94/95 to ensure funding.

EPA Questioned whether the Test 2 Plan was requesting a delay because it could not meet the deadline anyway. He was also questioning the impact of using EM-50 monies and having Lawrence Livermore involvement.

Feels that 903 Pad new technology approach might be a major change in the IM/IRA document and therefore the document might need to be reissued or supply an explanation of significant differences.

DOE Test 2 at Mound. Willing to incorporate Test 1 data in Final Report if the Final delivery date is pushed back to January 1994.

EPA No problems if time is used productively to utilize available data. Requested that 903 Pad be pursued under the Treatability Studies (Sitewide); especially Bench Scale testing.

Raised the concern that the public will expect three tests since the decision document states that three will be done. This maybe an issue.

CDH Skeptical that steam can push groundwater.

EPA Likes the idea of using electric heating of the claystones in the Mound area. Will accept the idea of a draft document with electric heating as a briefly discussed option (player to be named later-type option).

EPA/CDH May agree to schedule slip in exchange for electric heating at the Mound

EG&G Agrees to call and discuss options of electric heating after DOE and EG&G visit Lawrence Livermore.

CONCLUSION: CDH/EPA will make a decision of the draft Test Plan submittal date based on the Lawrence Livermore visit. The decisions on the Mound vs 903 Pad will also depend on the results of this visit. CDH/EPA agreed to delay the June 3, 1993 submittal date for Test Plan 2 until Test Plan 1 data is available. The deadline will be discussed again when everyone meets again. CDH and EPA agreed that the arguments presented were valid. At the next meeting, a decision will be made to resolve Mound /903 Pad, electric heating issues. Perhaps the East Trenches Test can be reconfigured to fulfill the three test obligations.

TM-8 BEDROCK WORK PLAN

Draft CDH and EPA were received at the meeting. CDH agreed to remove two comments due to the significant increase of associated analytical costs for one, and the potential for not being able to develop the wells for the other.

SCHEDULE RELIEF DUE TO OU1 DECISIONS

DOE/EG&G Presents impacts of OU1 decisions on OU2 schedule.

CDH/EPA General disagreement with this. Both assume work should have continued without impact of OU1 decisions. Questioned where Groundwater COC memo was and that it should discuss method, not COCs.

DOE/EG&G Stated that only one COC memo was planned and that GW COCs were impacted by OU1 decisions due to OU2 belief that this was necessary.

EPA Reminds EG&G/DOE that the COC flow chart was discussed and that no resolution of background was decided. However, EG&G presented at the OU1 meetings that background was decided. EG&G apologizes and explains what happened

Decision tree will be provided to RFP by EPA to address how background should be handled. This is supposed to represent EPA's view of the OU1 compromise decision on COCs.

While not giving any indication of granting a schedule extension, EPA indicated that if RFP wanted, a letter making the case of why an delay is justified should be sent. However, probably no action will be taken by EPA to discuss or resolve this request until after the delivery of the Draft Phase II RFI/RI Report.

CDH Stated that a case should be made to the Agencies after delivery of the Draft Phase II RFI/RI Report to justify the delay.

GROUNDWATER MODELING

EG&G presented the simplified model that will be used for the Draft Phase II RFI/RI Report. The model will treat the alluvium and Number One Sandstone as the same unit; will use steady state flow and transient transport. Constant head cells will be used for seeps. This will yield a conservative result. All choices were made conservatively. Simplified history matching will be used to verify reasonableness only.

CDH Seemed to agree with seep modeling. Did agree with history matching.

EPA Feels that the most conservative approach is best for modeling. Agreed with the treatment of the Number One Sandstone and the alluvium as the same unit.

EE

EPA suggested that the EE for OU2 be dropped in favor of a drainage basin EE as part of another OU, perhaps 5 and 6. Does this impact the ROD? Did not know how to administratively accomplish this.